

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

PAUL EDWARD BUNTING,)	CASE NO.: 4:04CV386
)	
Petitioner,)	JUDGE JOHN ADAMS
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER AND DECISION</u>
)	
DAVID BOBBY, WARDEN,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

This matter comes before the Court on Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation by Petitioner Paul Edward Bunting. (Doc. #93) This Court referred the matter to Magistrate Judge Gallas for a Report and Recommendation ("Report") on the habeas petition. The Court has been advised, having reviewed the Petition for Habeas Corpus, Return of Writ, Traverse, Report, Objection, and applicable law. It is hereby determined that the Court ADOPTS the Magistrate's Report IN WHOLE.

Petitioner filed a rambling 118 page Objection to the Report that contained numerous fundamental flaws in reasoning and analysis. Although Petitioner makes various allegations against the Magistrate, he does not even begin to discuss his objections until the 56th page of his document. He then uses the next 52 pages to state what he alleges are objections to the Report. Unfortunately, the document is quite difficult to read and equally confusing. Petitioner's ramblings make it nearly impossible to ascertain exactly what is being objected to. For these reasons, the Court will consider the document to be a general objection to the Report.

Failure to identify specific concerns with the report results in the entire objection being considered a general objection to the entire report. *McCready v. Kamminga*, 113 Fed. Appx. 47, 49 (6th Cir. 2004) unreported. General objections to the entirety of a magistrate judge's report have the same effect as a failure to object. *See Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir.1991). Although exceptional circumstances may warrant departure from this rule in the interests of justice, no such exceptional circumstances exist here. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985).

The Court, having conducted a *de novo* review of the pleadings, Report, Objection, and applicable law, finds that the Report is well-taken and is thus ADOPTED IN WHOLE. Therefore, the Petition for Habeas Corpus is DENIED.

So ordered.

Date: March 22. 2007

s/ Judge John R. Adams
JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT